

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13–16, and 19–21 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21 have been amended. As a result claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13-16, and 19–21 are pending for examination with claims 1, 16, 19 and 21 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Final Office Action dated November 12, 2009 (hereinafter the “Office Action”) rejected claim 1, 4-5, 7, 10, 13-16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178383 to Hrabik et al. (hereinafter Hrabik) in view of Albitz et al. (DNS and BIND) (hereinafter Albitz). In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 16, 19 and 21 and respectfully submits the following remarks.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 16, 19, and 21, as amended, patentable distinguish over Hrabik and Albitz, alone or in proper combination, because neither Hrabik or Albitz teach or suggest “determining a first mapping in a domain naming system, the act of determining the first mapping comprising an act of obtaining an authoritative mapping from an authoritative source of domain information in the domain naming system,” “comparing the first mapping to the second mapping and identifying at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping,” “and wherein the domain nameserver is a non-authoritative source for the second mapping in the domain naming system” as recited in each of claims 1, 16, and 19 as amended; or a detector “further adapted to compare the first mapping to the second mapping and to identify at least one discrepancy between the first mapping and second mapping,” “wherein the detector is configured to obtain an authoritative mapping represented by the first mapping from an authoritative source of domain name information in the domain naming system” and “determining a second mapping in the domain naming system... wherein the domain nameserver is a non-authoritative source for the second mapping in the domain naming system,” as recited in claim 21, as amended herein. (Emphasis added.) Notably, according to one embodiment, by permitting comparison and identification of discrepancies between authoritative and non-authoritative in a domain naming system, an administrator may be able to detect whether caching nameservers (examples of non-authoritative sources of domain information) have been poisoned (Please see Page 2, line 19 through Page 3, line 27 of the Instant Specification).

Hrabik is directed to a system for verifying the integrity of devices on a target network. (Hrabik, Abstract). The system has security subsystems and a master security system hierarchically connected to the security subsystem via a secure link. (Hrabik, Abstract). The target network includes various intrusion detection devices, which may be part of the security subsystem. (Hrabik, Abstract). Each intrusion detection device generates a plurality of event messages when an attach on the network is detected. (Hrabik, Abstract). The security subsystem collects these event messages, correlates, and analyzes them, and performs network scanning processes. (Hrabik, Abstract). If certain events warrant additional scrutiny, they are uploaded to the master security system for review. (Hrabik, Abstract).

Hrabik also discusses, in Paragraph [0069]:

In addition to the vulnerability and visibility scans, the master system 60 also verifies services that directly affect the target network's connectivity but are typically out of the network's control. This verification assessment ensures that company's domain name was not "hijacked." The master security system conducts a verification assessment of all information sources involved in network connectivity verifying information from a root domain name servers all the way through to a primary and a secondary web servers. The verification scan is performed for the entire IP address group of the target company. For example, when a target company has six IP addresses four of which are open and utilized and two of which are blocked and not accessible, the verification scan determines whether the blocked addresses remain inaccessible and whether the open addresses remain accessible. The assessment also includes a verification that when users are trying to access the network's website by typing "www.company.com," they get to the proper website and their e-mail goes to the proper server. The master system also verifies information at the Who is database of the registration provider to ensure that contact and authorization information has not been changed. To protect target's website, the master system may also check whether the text, graphics and other information contained on the website was not altered by intruders. The master system may also test functionality of target's e-commerce and other on-line applications to assure that the entire web system is operational and any problems may be addressed immediately. The master system also tests and verifies external (Internet) routing information, DNS info, netbios information, access control, etc. (Hrabik, Paragraph [0069].)

Thus, Hrabik is not concerned with comparing a first mapping of authoritative information in a domain naming system to a second mapping of non-authoritative information in the domain naming system and identifying at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping, as recited in each of claims 1, 16, and 19; or a detector further adapted to compare the first mapping of authoritative information in the domain naming system to the second mapping

of non-authoritative information in the domain naming system and to identify at least one discrepancy between the first mapping and second mapping, as recited in claim 21, as amended herein. Hrabik performs no such comparison between any first and second mapping of authoritative information. Rather, Hrabik is concerned with making sure a computer can get to a particular network's website, and that e-mail of a user goes to the proper server. (Hrabik, Paragraph [0069].) Hrabik does this by attempting to connect to various system resources by accessing their addresses. (Hrabik, Paragraph [0069].) Hrabik also discloses accessing information at a Whois database of the registration provider to ensure that contact and authorization information has not been changed. (Hrabik, Paragraph [0069].) However, Hrabik does not teach or suggest that this information is a mapping of a namespace to a resource in a domain naming system, nor does it teach or suggest that any such mapping of authoritative information will be compared to a second mapping of authoritative information to non-authoritative information. Hrabik also does not teach or suggest a method or apparatus for identifying at least one discrepancy between a first mapping of authoritative information and a second mapping of non-authoritative information. For at least these reasons, Hrabik does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 1, 16, 19, and 21 as amended.

Albitz fails to cure the deficiencies of Hrabik because Albitz is also not concerned with comparing a first mapping of authoritative information to a second mapping of non-authoritative information and identifying at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping, as recited in each of claims 1, 16, and 19; or a detector further adapted to compare the first mapping of authoritative information to the second mapping and to identify at least one discrepancy between the first mapping and second mapping, as recited in claim 21, as amended herein.

Albitz is directed to a conventional DNS system. Albitz is referenced in the Background section of the instant Application (located on Pages 1-2 of the instant Application), and describes a conventional configuration and function of nameservers typically used in the Internet and enterprises for resolving names to IP addresses. Specifically, it discloses a method whereby a user may copy information about a zone corresponding to a system resource. (Albitz, Page 220, "Zone Transfers," Paragraph 1.) Zone data can be transferred to an output file. (Albitz, Page 220, "Zone Transfers," Paragraph 3.)

Even if such zone data can be considered a mapping, and Applicants in no way concede that it can, Albitz does not teach or suggest performing a comparison between any first mapping

of authoritative information and second mapping of non-authoritative information. Rather, Albitz merely discloses the idea of transferring zone data into an output file. (Albitz, Page 220, “Zone Transfers,” Paragraph 3.) Albitz also does not teach or suggest a method or apparatus for identifying at least one discrepancy between a first mapping of authoritative information and a second mapping of non-authoritative information. For at least these reasons, Albitz does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 1, 16, 19, and 21.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 21 are patentable for at least the reasons described above. Each of claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 13–15, 20, and 21, depend directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 21, and are patentable at least for the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend, respectively. For at least all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10, 13-16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerald R. Malan, et al., Applicants

By: /Edward J. Russavage/
Edward J. Russavage, Reg. No. 43,069
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
United States of America
Telephone: 617-395-7000
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Docket No.: A0781-701810

Date: November 10, 2010